

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 12-14, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by DEKONING et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337); rejected claims 26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by COSSINS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290); rejected claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over WATSON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,784) in view of DEKONING et al.; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,185); rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al., and further in view of DOOLAN (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,955); rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of DOOLAN; rejected claims 17, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BRANTON, JR. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,336); rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al.; rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al., and further in view of BRANTON, JR. et al.; rejected claims 27, 31, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of SITARAMAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,170); rejected claims 42, 47, 49, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,212); and rejected claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al., and further in view of DEKONING et al.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

By way of this amendment, claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 26, 30, and 34 have been amended to improve form. Claims 1-53 remain pending.

Claims 1-6, 12-14, 20, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by DEKONING et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method for managing a network. The method includes providing a first list of events occurring in the network to a graphical user interface; simultaneously providing a second list of events occurring in the network to the graphical user interface, where the second list comprises a predetermined number of most recent events; and managing the network using the first and second lists.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Applicants' claim 1.

For example, DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest providing a first list of events occurring in the network to a graphical user interface and simultaneously providing a second list of events occurring in the network to the graphical user interface, where the second list of events comprises a predetermined number of most recent events, as required by claim 1. The Examiner relied on col. 5, lines 24-31, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing providing a first list and col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing providing a second list (Office Action, pg. 2). Applicants respectfully submit that these sections of DEKONING et al. do not disclose or suggest the providing features, as currently recited.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

At col. 5, lines 24-31, DEKONING et al. discloses:

A list is then acquired that identifies the objects stored within the subject subsystem that are required for managing the subsystem (step 62). In a preferred embodiment, the list is acquired from the subject subsystem using the network medium 20. That is, a request is delivered to the subject subsystem over the network medium 20 and the subject subsystem then transfers the list back over the network medium 20.

This section of DEKONING et al. discloses acquiring a list of objects that identifies objects stored within a subject subsystem that are required for managing the subsystem.

This section of DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest that the list is provided to a graphical user interface, as currently recited in Applicants' claim 1.

At col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, DEKONING et al. discloses that a cache memory 26 stores objects that are newly retrieved from subsystems 14-18. DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest that these newly retrieved objects are simultaneously provided with the list of acquired objects to the graphical user interface. Instead, DEKONING et al. discloses comparing the list of acquired objects to the objects stored in cache memory 26 to determine if additional objects need to be acquired (col. 5, lines 42-59).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by DEKONING et al.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by DEKONING et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Moreover, these claims recite features not disclosed or suggested by DEKONING et al.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

For example, claim 2 recites setting the number of events to be provided in the second list. The Examiner relied on col. 6, lines 1-8, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 2). Applicants submit that this section of DEKONING et al. does not disclose the feature of claim 2.

At col. 5, line 67, to col. 6, line 8, DEKONING et al. discloses:

In the preferred embodiment of the present invention, the cache memory 26 has a fixed size that is considerably less than the size required to store all of the objects associated with the subsystems of the network. Therefore, intelligence is provided for determining which of the objects that are newly retrieved from the subsystems 14-18 are to be stored in the cache memory 26. If the cache memory 26 is empty or only partially full, then all of the most recently retrieved objects can be stored therein.

This section of DEKONING et al. discloses that the size of cache memory 26 is fixed.

This section of DEKONING et al. in no way discloses or suggests setting the number of events to be provided in the second list. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner specifically point out where DEKONING et al. discloses that the number of objects to be stored in cache memory 26 can be set.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 2 is not anticipated by DEKONING et al.

Amended independent claims 6 and 12 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 12 are not anticipated by DEKONING et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Therefore, this claim is not anticipated by DEKONING et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 12.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

Moreover, claim 13 recites a feature similar to a feature recited above with respect to claim 2. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 13 is not anticipated by DEKONING et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

Independent claim 14 recites a device for managing a network having a plurality of network elements. The device includes a memory configured to store instructions; and a processor configured to execute the instructions to provide a list of identifiers associated with the plurality of network elements, where each network element identifier is associated with a state indication. DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest each network identifier being associated with a state indication. The Examiner relied on col. 5, lines 44-45, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants disagree.

At col. 5, lines 44-46, DEKONING et al. discloses that each of the management related objects in the network is given a globally unique identifier. This section of DEKONING et al. in no way discloses or suggests that each network identifier is associated with a state indication. In fact, this section of DEKONING et al. merely discloses associating a unique identifier with an object.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by DEKONING et al.

Independent claims 20 and 24 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

DEKONING et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claims 26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-46, and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by COSSINS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended independent claim 26 recites a method for managing a network having a plurality of network devices. The method includes associating events in the network with one of the plurality of network devices; providing a geographical map, where the geographical map displays locations of each of the plurality of network devices and indicates which of the plurality of network devices are associated with at least one event; and managing the network using the geographical map, where the managing includes detecting selection of a network device in the plurality of network devices and providing a more detailed view of a geographical area around the selected network device in response to the detecting. COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest detecting selection of a network device in the plurality of network devices and providing a more detailed view of a geographical area around the selected network device in response to the detecting. In contrast, COSSINS et al. discloses that a user can select, using a legend, a distance of a search range surrounding a selected network element for which a map will be generated (col. 26, lines 19-22). COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest, however, providing the selected range in response to detecting that a network element has been selected, as required by amended claim 26.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 26 is not anticipated by COSSINS et al.

Claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 26. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 26.

Amended independent claims 30 and 34 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 26.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 30. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 30.

Claims 36 and 37 depend from claim 34. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Independent claim 38 recites a device for managing a network having a plurality of network elements. The device includes a memory configured to store instructions and a processor configured to execute the instructions to associate each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes and provide a network map. The network map displays relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes. COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

For example, COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 13-29, of COSSINS et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants submit that this section of COSSINS et al. does not disclose or suggest this feature of Applicants' claim 38.

At col. 10, lines 13-29, COSSINS et al. discloses:

As used herein, generating a map also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display a map, depending on context. Likewise, generating geospatial data, network data, or geographic data also can be construed to mean generating data to be used by the user browser 418 to display the geospatial data, network data, or geographic data, depending on context. Similarly generating network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display the network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics, depending on context. Thus, generating any data also means generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display the data or representations of the data, depending on context.

This section of COSSINS et al. discloses that a browser 418 may use data and/or signaling to display geospatial data, network data, geographic data, network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, data or representations of the data. This section of COSSINS et al. in no way discloses or suggests a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes.

Since COSSINS et al. does not disclose a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes, COSSINS et al. cannot disclose the processor providing a network map, where the network map displays relationships

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 13-29, of COSSINS et al. for disclosing this additional feature of Applicants' claim 38 (Office Action, pg. 5). As set forth above, this section of COSSINS et al. merely discloses that a browser 418 may use data and/or signaling to display geospatial data, network data, geographic data, network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, data or representations of the data. This section of COSSINS et al. in no way discloses or suggests a processor providing a network map, where the network map displays relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes, as required by claim 38.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 38 is not anticipated by COSSINS et al.

Claims 39-41 depend from claim 38. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 38. Moreover, these claims recite features not anticipated by COSSINS et al.

For example, claim 39 recites that the plurality of logical planes includes one or more of a transmission plane, a switching plane, a customer access plane, and a signaling plane. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 21-24, of COSSINS et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 5). Applicants disagree.

At col. 10, lines 21-27, COSSINS et al. discloses:

Similarly generating network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

the user browser 418 to display the network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics, depending on context.

This section of COSSINS et al. in no way relates to the feature recited in Applicants' claim 39. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain how this section relates to the feature recited in Applicants' claim 39.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 39 is not anticipated by COSSINS et al.

Independent claims 43 and 48 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 38. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 38.

Claims 44-46 depend from claim 43. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by COSSINS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 43.

Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over WATSON et al. in view of DEKONING et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended independent claim 7 recites a system for managing a network. The system includes a user device configured to transmit a request for current network information, provide a first list of events occurring in the network via a graphical user interface, and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network via the graphical user interface, the second list comprising a number of most recent events. The system further includes a server configured to receive the request for current network information and provide the current network information to the user device. WATSON

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

et al. and DEKONING et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, WATSON et al. and DEKONING et al. do not disclose or suggest a user device configured to provide a first list of events occurring in the network via a graphical user interface and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network via the graphical user interface, the second list comprising a number of most recent events. The Examiner admitted that WATSON et al. does not disclose these features and relied on col. 5, lines 24-40, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing providing a first list and col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, of DEKONING et al. for allegedly disclosing providing a second list (Office Action, pp. 6-7). Applicants respectfully submit that these sections of DEKONING et al. do not disclose or suggest the providing features, as currently recited.

At col. 5, lines 24-40, DEKONING et al. discloses:

A list is then acquired that identifies the objects stored within the subject subsystem that are required for managing the subsystem (step 62). In a preferred embodiment, the list is acquired from the subject subsystem using the network medium 20. That is, a request is delivered to the subject subsystem over the network medium 20 and the subject subsystem then transfers the list back over the network medium 20. In another embodiment, the lists associated with each of the subsystems 14-18 are stored within a list memory coupled to or within the client machine 12. A list is acquired by reading it from the list memory. The list memory can be loaded during an initialization period (e.g., at system startup) by downloading the lists from the corresponding subsystems 14-18 over the network medium 20 and storing them in the list memory. The list memory is then updated and modified as individual subsystems, are added/removed/modified.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

This section of DEKONING et al. discloses acquiring a list of objects that identifies objects stored within a subject subsystem that are required for managing the subsystem. This section of DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest that the list is provided via a graphical user interface, as currently recited in Applicants' claim 7.

At col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, DEKONING et al. discloses that a cache memory 26 stores objects that are newly retrieved from subsystems 14-18. DEKONING et al. does not disclose or suggest that these newly retrieved objects are simultaneously provided with the list of acquired objects on the graphical user interface. Instead, DEKONING et al. discloses comparing the list of acquired objects to the objects stored in cache memory 26 to determine if additional objects need to be acquired (col. 5, lines 42-59).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over WATSON et al. and DEKONING et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 8-11 depend from claim 7. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WATSON et al. and DEKONING et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 7.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BASS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

over DEKONING et al. and BASS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al., and further in view of DOOLAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of DEKONING et al. and BASS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over DEKONING et al., BASS et al., and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of DOOLAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 19 depends from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over DEKONING et al. and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 21 is

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

patentable over DEKONING et al. and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claims 17, 18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BRANTON, JR. et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BRANTON, JR. et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 17 and 18 are patentable over DEKONING et al. and BRANTON, JR. et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 22 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BRANTON, JR. et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 22 is patentable over DEKONING et al. and BRANTON, JR. et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 23 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of COSSINS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 23 is

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

patentable over DEKONING et al. and COSSINS et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al., and further in view of BRANTON, JR. et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24. Applicants submit that the disclosures of COSSINS et al. and BRANTON, JR. et al. do not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 25 is patentable over DEKONING et al., COSSINS et al., and BRANTON, JR. et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 24.

Claims 27, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of SITARAMAN et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 27 depends from claim 26. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over COSSINS et al. and SITARAMAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 26.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 31 is

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

patentable over COSSINS et al. and SITARAMAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 30.

Claim 35 depends from claim 34. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over COSSINS et al. and SITARAMAN et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Claims 42, 47, 49, and 51-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 42 depends from claim 38. Applicants submit that the disclosure of EICK et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 38. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 42 is patentable over COSSINS et al. and EICK et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 38.

Claim 47 depends from claim 43. Applicants submit that the disclosure of EICK et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 43. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 47 is patentable over COSSINS et al. and EICK et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 43.

Independent claim 49 recites a system for managing a network having a plurality of network elements. The system includes a user device configured to provide a user

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, a network summary option, a geographical network management option, and a three-dimensional network management option. The user device is further configured to transmit, in response to a selection of an option by the user, a request for current network information and provide the user with current network information according to the selected option. The system further includes a server configured to receive the request for current network information and transmit current network information to the user device. COSSINS et al. and EICK et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, COSSINS et al. and EICK et al. do not disclose a user device configured to provide a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, a network summary option, a geographical network management option, and a three-dimensional network management option. The Examiner relied on col. 4, lines 18-22, of COSSINS et al. for allegedly disclosing a network element diagnostic option and col. 11, lines 55-60, of COSSINS et al. for allegedly disclosing a network summary option (Office Action, pg. 18).

Applicants submit that these sections of COSSINS et al. do not disclose or suggest a user device that provides a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option and a network summary option.

At col. 4, lines 18-22, COSSINS et al. discloses:

The GNMS 104 automatically creates customer defined "trouble areas" when a new trouble ticket is created within a specified range of a specified number of other trouble tickets. The range and the number can be defined

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

by a user or pre-set. In addition, the GNMS 104 allows entry of an engineer defined or user defined trouble area.

This section of COSSINS et al. discloses that a customer-defined trouble area can be created when a new trouble ticket is created. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, this section of COSSINS et al. in no way discloses or suggests a user device that provides a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, as required by Applicants' claim 49.

At col. 11, lines 55-60, COSSINS et al. discloses:

A performance layer displays network elements with associated performance elements. This allows a user to view, for example, an alarm status of a network element and/or a performance status of the network element at the same time. Alternately, the performance layer can be configured to display only the performance elements.

This section of COSSINS et al. discloses a performance layer that displays network elements and associated performance elements. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, this section of COSSINS et al. in no way discloses or suggests a user device that provides a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network summary option, as required by Applicants' claim 49.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 49 is patentable over COSSINS et al. and EICK et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 51-53 depend from claim 49. Therefore, these claims are patentable over COSSINS et al. and EICK et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 49.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al., and further in view of DEKONING et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 50 depends from claim 49. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DEKONING et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of COSSINS et al. and EICK et al. set forth above with respect to claim 49. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 50 is patentable over COSSINS et al., EICK et al., and DEKONING et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 49.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

PATENT
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §
1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the
filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By:


Joel Wall
Reg. No. 25,648

Date: March 30, 2004

Customer No. 32127
600 Hidden Ridge Drive
Mail Code: HQE03H14
Irving, Texas 75038
(972) 718-4800